

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/298351650>

The significance of William Shakespeare for the development of English word-formation

Chapter · March 2006

CITATION

1

READS

23,648

1 author:



Vladimir Ž. Jovanović

University of Niš

61 PUBLICATIONS 73 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



SCHEMAS (Structuring Concept Generation with the Help of Metaphor, Analogy and Schematicity) [View project](#)

Jovanović, V. Ž. (2006). The Significance of William Shakespeare for the development of English word-formation. In: K. Rasulić & I. Trbojević (Eds.), *ELLS75: Interfaces and Integrations* (pp. 109 – 122). Belgrade: University of Belgrade.

Vladimir Ž. Jovanović

Faculty of Philosophy /English Department
Niš University

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH WORD-FORMATION

ABSTRACT

This paper is yet another statement in favour of the unbreakable link that is existent between the studies of language and literature. On a more concrete level, the paper is concerned with the role that the greatest poet of the English language had in the development of English in general, and specifically of its Morphology and Word-formation. The creativity that the great laureate manifested in language use found its best expression within the formation mechanisms such as derivation, conversion, composition, borrowing and some of the less prominent processes. A series of illustrative examples serves to support the conclusions and facts about the indubitably serious influence that Shakespeare exerted in the language which was his vehicle for the creation of works that will remain a part of world's cultural heritage.

1. INTRODUCTION

The entire activity of studying a certain culture rests upon the fundament made by language and literature studies. Studying a language of a nation without making an effort into the literature written in that particular language may remain deficient in terms of a series of insightful observations which could considerably facilitate the understanding of the most characteristic phenomena of language-based communication. In this respect, we can even contend that between language and literature there exists a certain unbreakable and fructifying feedback relationship. Language, as the basic means of communication is the medium in which literature, as a kind of art, is realized. On the other hand, literature provides the language with a necessary wealth of expressive devices, making it ever so

contemporary, complete, and versatile; literature is a sort of incubator for any type of creativity in language.

This introductory perspective offers a clear inference that a substantial responsibility lies with the authors in a language and that they should play a double role in the process of creative writing. However, in order to remain true to the point of this paper, we shall focus our attention to the contribution of the English 'bard of all bards' to the language of his people and make a coherent account of all the remarkable and precious observations regarding the modes in which Shakespeare made a lasting and permanent change on the word-formation of the language in which Bunyan, Chaucer and others had written before him.

Understandably enough, almost everything has been said or written about Shakespeare so far, about the vastness of his poetic genius, about the sophistication of his verse, about the cosmopolitanism of his opus. It has been precisely determined and statistically accounted for that each day there should occur at least one paper written on a topic concerning Shakespeare. The author of these lines would like to humbly assume that this is the paper which could be counted among the ones for today, or at least that this one was missing in the array of such endeavours.

2. SHAKESPEARE'S CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

One thing is for sure. William Shakespeare was a king of words and his work is a true repository of lexical treasure. He was a grand master of lining words, intertwining them, culling them, weighing them, toying with them, using them in unusual positions, functions and forms. This is no wonder when we take into consideration that the lexical contingent that was at his disposal was, varying from one source to another, from 20.000 to 100.000. More realistic calculations would concede only 15.000 to 25.000, though. Quite a lot in either case, one should think, for a man from an era in which there were no technological frills, no highly complicated human institutions nor relationships. But, to avail myself of the words of Otto Jespersen (1978: 202) who has put it succinctly enough, "the greatness of Shakespeare's mind is [...] not shown by the fact that he was

acquainted with 20.000 words, but by the fact that he wrote about so great a variety of subjects and touched upon so many human facts and relations that he needed this number of words in his writing". Of course, we are interested in the use of language of Shakespeare as a writer, and not as a common man who lived and walked in Elizabethan England. His major works were created during the period known to us as the Early Modern English Period which lasted from 1500 to 1800. Historians of the language even tend to label this stage in the development of English as *the language of Shakespeare*¹ (successive to the language of Chaucer), which can for itself significantly point out the idea how decisive Shakespeare's writing must have been for the shaping of the language in total.

The language of Elizabethan England was different from the language of the previous periods and it fed on the growth and development of the society in general. The commercial and military expansion of the kingdom also affected the lexicon of the language by expanding it though borrowing form other languages of more or less distant and happier lands that the speakers of English came into contact with. English lexicon, and therefrom the language itself had become not only larger, but a flexible entity as well, susceptible to modelling and re-arranging of the elements. Many of the new words from various languages were promoted by Shakespeare in his plays and many more words were introduced into the language by Shakespeare himself, either through accepting words from French, Italian, and Spanish or due to the revival of classical tradition through Latin and Greek.

How did Shakespeare influence the language and how can this be best seen and explained? His unrivalled eloquence and elevated language have often been explained by his employment as a legal office clerk or his closeness to the English court. On the other hand, he was equally adroit in putting words into the mouth of characters as Falstaff or Bottom. What is definitive is that Shakespeare was a master of bringing together the classical sources and originally English elements of expression. Perhaps most credit to his language can be still given to his insistence on avoiding stereotypes, perseverance against conventions and his

¹ B. A. Fennell (2003) *A History of English*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp 135-166.

keen perception. As O. Jespersen justly assumes,² Shakespeare's most characteristic feature in language use was his boldness. The literary critics have always praised the boldness of his metaphors, whereas the others have found charm in his sentence structure which sometimes grappled with the rules of erstwhile English grammar. Shakespeare was often scoffed for this negligence in the grammaticalness of his structures by a pedant named Alex Schmidt, who obviously failed to predict that in this boldness in experimentation lay the way to expansion and that it gave such a powerful impetus to certain word-formation processes in English such as primary and secondary conversion, back-formation, etc. It is the poetic language, the poetic licence that poets are granted in terms of distorting the language that breaks in new usage, new vocabulary. The poets are the ones to set off "poetic" words and meanings which later on become used by the others, and no longer deemed substandard or unorthodox. This inflates the boundaries of acceptable lexical usage and slowly moves the language beyond the borders of the existing.

3. WORD-FORMATION AND SHAKESPEARE

It is not very well-established a tendency in the study of word-formation to speak of the merits of individuals in terms of the overall domain, but when an individual stands out so prominently as Shakespeare does in English, it is probably only natural to be interested in the signet of his idiosyncrasy sealed on the artistic medium.

This great playwright and poet may not have introduced a new bound morpheme or suffix into the language, but his influence on the formative processes of words in English is considerable from a different viewpoint. Moreover, Shakespeare did not manufacture nor invent words, thus setting a new formation type. And yet, as Y. M. Biese, a Swedish scholar who produced one of the most valuable studies on conversions in English, said "Shakespeare is one of

² O. Jespersen (1978) *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, p. 209.

the most important names in the history of creative English word-formation".³ Shakespeare was significant for the development of the formative capacities of the language because he presented a potent relay, provided some of the already initiated tendencies in the use of language with a powerful swing. He also displayed great boldness in forming and transforming words to suit his needs as skilfully as he made use of the familiar ones. Therefore, it may be of interest for us to see Shakespeare's immediate impact on the lexicon through the matrix of traditional word-formation processes and patterns.

3.1 Derivation

Apparently, most of the derivative words attributed to Shakespeare were those formed by means of suffixation with adjective forming suffixes such as *-able/-ible*, *-ful*, *-ive*, thus giving force to his unique skill of inserting adequate attributes. The one to be rather creatively used by Shakespeare was often erroneously taken to stem from the English adjective *able*, whereas it stems from the suffix of the French language. Apart from the well-used derivatives *lonely* and *baseless*, the following words are Shakespeare's indubitable contribution:

<u>-able/-ible</u>	<i>answerable</i> ⁴ <i>indistinguishable</i>	<i>laughable</i> <i>unmatchable</i>
<u>-ful</u>	<i>eventful</i> <i>fretful</i>	<i>fitful</i>
<u>-ish</u>	<i>dragonish</i> = 'in the shape of a dragon'	
<u>-ive</u>	<i>forgetive</i> = 'creative'	
<u>-ous</u>	<i>inauspicious</i>	<i>multitudinous</i>
<u>-less</u>	<i>dauntless</i>	

Derived nouns of Shakespeare's shaping are not many, *courtship* perhaps being the most prominent one, whereas novel verbs such as *sluggardize* as in

³ Y.M.Biese (1941) *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 45, 2, Helsinki, p. 319.

⁴ As OED points out, the formation *answerable* is "an early instance of this as a living Eng. Suffix" to mean the following: Liable to be called to account; under legal or moral obligation; responsible, accountable, giving a quotation from 1596 Shakes. 1 Hen. IV, ii. iv. 571 *If he haue robb'd these men, He shall be answerable*.

Living dully sluggardiz'd at home from *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act I, Scene 1, Line 7 are few and far between.

Among the words of contemporary English to have been coined by him, the best known of the words obtained by prefixation are the ones derived with the prefix *en-*. The most common of them perhaps is the word *enthroned*, which he used for the first time in the play *Anthony & Cleopatra*, line 5, Act III, Scene 6: *Cleopatra and himselfe in Chaires of Gold Were publikely enthron'd*. In general, his poetic use of this prefix gave birth to other forms such as *enmesh*, *enrank*, *enridge*, *enschedule*, *ensear*, *ensteeped*, *entame*, *entreasure*.

As Albert C. Baugh (1957: 281) states and OED confirms, we should be indebted to Shakspeare for the introduction of several now common prefixed words, launched in the form of participles. Although it is not completely clear whether the word *misanthrope* should be counted among these, the other three, namely *premeditated*, *unprizable* and *submerge* were most certainly printed for the first time in his poetic works.⁵ Other forms, on the other hand, have not survived the test of time and failed to take root, primarily *imperceiverant*, a derivative meaning "void of perception".

3.2 Composition

Nominal compounds were the weakest field of Shakespeare's influence on the formation of words. On the other hand, Shakespeare was most certainly one of the few individuals whose merit was the initiation of compounding or lexicalizing adverbial particle phrases by means of adding the agentive suffix to the verb. Thus, we have few instances in English which we could treat as combined derivation and compounding. The form used by the poet was to be found in the phrase *the finder-out of this secret* or *the goer-back* which gave rise to several other formations upon this pattern.⁶ Other noun compounds that are often

⁵ OED quotes as follows: 1590 Shakes. *Mids. N. v. i.* 96 *Great Clearkes haue purposed To greete me with premeditated welcome*, 1601 Shakes. *Twel. N. v. i.* 58 *A bawbling Vessell was he Captaine of, For shallow draught and bulke vnprizable* and 1606 Shakes. *Ant. & Cl. ii. v.* 94 *So halfe my Egypt were submerg'd and made A Cesterne for scal'd Snakes*.

⁶ The compounds *finder-out* and *weeder-out* are sometimes spelt without hyphen in many of the editions of Shakespeare's plays. However, the Compact edition of his Complete Works published by OUP gives it in the hyphenated form in the play *The Winter's Tale*, line 122 of Act V, Scene two and *Richard III* line 123, Act I, Scene 3, respectively.

attributed to Shakespeare are *eye-beam*, *eye-drop*, *eye-wink*, *fire-work*, *loggerhead*, *leap-frog*, *widow-dolour*, etc.

Much more conspicuous was his creativity in terms of producing qualifiers that would incorporate complex notions or polyvalent descriptions. Thus, Shakespeare was the originator of such words based on the present participle second element as the words from *Hamlet* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*: *gaingiving*, *home-keeping*, or the past participle: *barefaced*, *fire-robed*, *fire-eyed*, *loggerheaded*, *red-looked*. Also significant is the template upon which the following compound adjectives were formed.

<i>arm-gaunt</i>	<i>gravel-blind</i>	<i>fire-new</i>
<i>broad-blown</i>	<i>dog-weary</i>	
<i>forthright</i>	<i>lack-lustre</i>	

Rather peculiar was his tendency to use copulative compound adjectives without the connector *and*. The earlier editions of his plays have these lexical forms printed as unhyphenated, whereas some of the more recent ones stress their unity by placing the hyphen in between, as in *Urge the necessity and state of times*, *And be not peevish-fond in great designs* or *I am too childish-foolish for this world*, both from *Richard III*.

We should by no means forget to mention those Shakespeare's words which were created out of extraordinary observing powers and expressive volubility, which Bradley (1975:85) calls 'audacities':

<i>proud-pied April</i>	<i>wrong-incensed peers</i>
<i>heaven-kissing hill</i>	<i>woe-wearied tongue</i>
<i>so-long-sund'red friends</i>	<i>hell-govern'd arm</i>

Be *lion-mettled*, proud, and take no care

Scarce-bearded Caesar
Shrill-tongued Fulvia
Full-fortuned

In forming new verb compounds, Shakespeare was rather inventive. His compound verbs based on the pattern of pre-posing the adverbial particle to a nominal root such as in the verb "to out-Herod Herod" were the touchstone for generations of writers and speakers of English. As Bradley (1975: 154) states, "all the words of this kind that exist in Modern English appear to have been framed either by him, or by later writers in imitation of his example". The rest of the domain encompasses formations such as *to after-eye* with the meaning of 'to look

after', *to winter-ground* which is 'to protect a plant from the inclemency of the winter-season', *to under-peep* 'to peep from under', all of which can be found in the play *Cymbeline* at various places.

3.3 Conversion

We may say that Shakespeare is one of the greatest promoters of conversion as a language process in English. The progressive loss of the infinitival morpheme *-en*, first the latter and then the former phoneme, then the gradual removal of any distinct formal difference between many words from opposed classes presented a mighty gift to a crafty genius. Thus, he used many words in a class and function other than the existing one in order to achieve various effects on the style of his writing and on the audience and readers of his works therefrom. Converting words was Shakespeare's major mainstay when it came to writing in his renowned elevated style, but he also reached out for this feature when he wanted to amuse his audience. Biese (1941: 413-416) mentioned several lines which added "...forceful and vivid expression" to his plays, lines like the ones from *Othello* line 72 of Act IV, Scene 1: O, 'tis the spite of hell, the fiend's arch-mock, *To lip* a wanton in a secure couch, And to suppose her chaste! No, let me know, And knowing what I am, I know what she shall be. The comical effect was achieved when he made constable Dogberry in *Much Ado about Nothing* line 64 of Act III, Scene 5 say *Go, good partner, go get you to Francis Seacoal; bid him bring his pen and inkhorn to the jail. We are now to examination these men.* Most of the following illustrative words are due to Jespersen (1978:211), Biese (1941:78-8)

Noun > Verb

Obviously, the largest portion of conversion-words used by Shakespeare for the first time is made up of verbs converted from nouns. Biese's list of such words which occur as first instances in Shakespeare's works contains 106 entries, although the list can be complemented even further. The greatest majority of the cases of conversion-verbs Shakespeare used were transitive verbs (84%), and only 16% of them were intransitive verbs. Also, a difference in meaning between Shakespeare's use and contemporary use is noticeable in certain examples such as

the now obsolete meaning of the verb *to foot* as "to strike or thrust with the foot, to kick".⁷

blanket – to blanket

*bound – to bound**

cater – to cater

elbow – to elbow

*foot – to foot**

hand – to hand

incarnadine – to incarnadine = to redden

jade – to jade

label – to label

*park – to park** = confine or enclose as in a park

stranger – to stranger

torture – to torture

*window – to window** = place in a window
= make full of holes

Verb > Noun

Another group of more than 54 conversion-nouns are directly attributed to Shakespeare, since they did not appear in the written form before Shakespeare put them in one of his works.

*to control – control**

to dawn – dawn

*to dress – dress**

to embrace – embrace

to shudder – shudder

*to hatch – hatch**

to import – import

to indent – indent

to resolve – resolve

to sneak – sneak

Other conversion types

More prominent than the others is his use of converted verbs from adjectives and adverbs (Biese lists 15 such uses), but some unusual formations outside this pattern can be found in Shakespeare's work as well, such as the use of *aslant* as a preposition. The great author was also the first to use the adverb *atone* (a form obtained by telescoping from *at one*) as a verb in the play *The Tragedy of King Richard the Second*, line 202 of Act I, Scene 1. Some other earliest known uses of converted words are:

forward – to forward

happy – to happy

lower – to lower

muddy – to muddy

It is easy to perceive the domains of Shakespeare's liberal attitude towards the elements of language from the following quotation by Simon Potter (Potter 1977: 57), one of the most knowledgeable persons about the English language:

⁷ The words marked with asterisk are the ones not to be found in Biese's lists.

Shakespeare used adverb as verb ('That from their own misdeeds *askance* their eyes', Lucrece 637), or as a substantive ('In the dark *backward* and abysm of time, The Tempest', I.ii. 50), or as adjective ('Blunting the fine point of *seldom* pleasure', Sonnet 111)

Among other things connected to conversion that Shakespeare contributed to the abundance of lexical means of English is the so called adjectival function of nouns, where aside from the clichéd and ordinary examples, he used a number of nouns as adjectives quite uniquely. That Shakespeare actually was the person to further this phenomenon in English could be instanced by the words of Viola in line 257, Act 1, Scene 5 of *Twelfth Night*: *Make me a willow cabin at your gate, And call upon my soul within the house* or Macbeth in line 50, Act IV, Scene 1 of *The Tragedy of Macbeth*: *How now, you secret, black, and midnight hags?* However, it can be noticed that the extensive and highly diversified use of derived and compound adjectives in Shakespeare's writing adversely affected the number of attributively used nouns, which is comparatively small. At places Shakespeare quite uncommonly placed qualifiers before such conversions as in *Why, this is very midsummer madness*, Act 3 scene 4, line 54 of *Twelfth Night*.

Not all the words William Shakespeare coined have survived in English. Regardless of the great poet's unquestionable authority, certain words that were used in his plays died out along with the items from ELR they referred to. This is particularly true of words such as the verb *virginal* he used in *The Winter's Tale*, line 124, Act I, Scene 2, with the meaning which OED specifies as 'to tap with the fingers as on a virginal': *To be padling Palmes, and pinching Fingers, Still Virginalling Vpon his Palme?* This can also be stated about some of the derivatives such as *barful*, something which is 'full of bars or hindrances' or *tongueless* in the sense 'unmentioned, not spoken of'.

All in all, a more quantitative measure of his influence on the language in terms of conversion is supplied in Biese's comprehensive study: "*Of the total number of conversions introduced into the English language while Shakespeare was writing, nearly one-fourth is found in his works as first quotations*".⁸

⁸ Y. M. Biese (1941) *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*, Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 45, 2, Helsinki, p 83.

3.4 Back-formation

There are several words of English formed on the model of back-formation the origin of which can be traced back to William Shakespeare. The author was allegedly responsible for the back-forming of the verb *grovel* or *grovell* from the 13th century adverb *grovelling*, mistaken as a present participle form, which appeared for the first time in his play *Henry VI* in 1593. Later on, the form as such continued to be employed in literary pieces by Pope, Dickens, Trollope, etc. Bradley (1975:154) mentions the adjective *credent* which could be thought of as a reduction of *credential*. Namely, giving the explanation of this word as 'believing, trustful, confiding', OED quotes Shakespeare as the first source: 1602 *Shakes. Ham. i. iii. 30 If with too credent eare you list his Songs*. The same could be said of another poetic word "back-formed" from an already existing one, actually the verb *illumine* is also to be found in *Hamlet*, line 37, Act I, Scene 1: *When yond same Starre Had made his course t' illumine that part of Heauen Where now it burnes*. However, OED itself treats this word as a shortening of the word *illumine*.

3.5 Reduplication

Among the words of English which have come into being on the pattern of duplicating the root morpheme, several are known to have been introduced by Shakespeare. Almost without exception these words are based upon non-repetitive reduplication of word roots. The most frequently quoted examples are:

<i>skimble-skamble</i>	<i>tittle-tattle</i>
<i>shilly-shally</i>	<i>zig-zag</i>

3.6 Borrowing

This was perhaps the most prominent vocabulary enrichment mode, together with conversion, when it comes to the ways Shakespeare contributed to expand the lexicon. Quite a few words of English are for one reason or another associated with Shakespeare as the "importer", even though the research conducted by O. F. Emerson proved Shakespeare to be an author who resorted to

domestic lexical resources more often than not.⁹ The list of words includes some words normally used in everyday communication by a wide range of contemporary speakers of English.

<i>acceptance</i>	<i>emphasis</i>	<i>orb</i>
<i>accommodation</i>	<i>frugal</i>	<i>pedant</i>
<i>agile</i>	<i>gull</i>	<i>premedital</i>
<i>apostrophe</i>	<i>horrid</i>	<i>prodigious</i>
<i>assassination</i>	<i>impertinency</i>	<i>reliance</i>
<i>critical</i>	<i>misanthrope</i>	<i>rely</i>
<i>demonstrate</i>	<i>modest</i>	<i>summit</i>
<i>dexte(i)rously</i>	<i>obscene</i>	<i>vast</i>

Many simple structured words were used by Shakespeare for the first time. When we say this, we mean that there had been no official records of a word before Shakespeare used it and printed it in his works for the first time and is thus considered by the lexicographers as the primer source of the word which may have been otherwise well used in spoken language. Anyhow, quite a few words from OED have their etymological background traced back to Shakespeare. Later on, some of these words came to be accepted by other authors in poetry such as Keats, Coleridge, Browning, Tennyson and Swinburne who used them in their works and which definitely set the way to full acceptance by the language community.

<i>abandon</i>	<i>cerement</i>	<i>gouts</i>
<i>abhorre</i>	<i>character</i>	<i>gust</i>
<i>abrupt</i>	<i>dickens</i>	<i>have got</i> = 'have'
<i>absurd</i>	<i>dislocate</i>	<i>hint</i>
<i>action</i>	<i>dwindle</i>	<i>hurry</i>
<i>antre</i>	<i>eager</i> = 'cold'	<i>lush</i>
<i>atomy</i>	<i>eld</i>	<i>perusal</i>
<i>beetle</i> = 'summit of cliff'	<i>excellent</i>	<i>pink</i> = 'perfection'
<i>bump</i>	<i>farrow</i>	<i>primy</i>
<i>call</i> = 'to pay a visit'	<i>fount</i> = 'spring'	<i>weird</i> = 'destiny, fate'

An important semantic feature has been noticed by many scholars who dealt with the words imported to English and the way they are perceived now. With a

⁹ See Wood (1961:49). In *A Brief History of the English Language*, Professor Emerson gave the results of his study dealing with the percentage of the language of native origin in the works of distinguished English writers. According to the findings, 90% of Shakespeare's writing was based on language devoid of any foreign influences, as compared to the 81% of Milton, or 75% of Swift.

number of those, it is quite obvious that certain semantic change has occurred over time (Fennel 2001:147):

One difference between many of the borrowed words in use at the time of Shakespeare and those in use now is that Shakespeare's time their meaning was much more faithful to the meaning in the source language. Over time, however their meaning shifted, so that, in a frequently cited example, communicate, which now means 'to talk' or 'to change information' at that time meant 'to share with others'. In *A Comedy of Errors*, for example, we encounter the following lines from Adriana, in which she clearly shares the strength with her husband:

*Thou art an elm, my husband, I a vine.
Whose weakness married to thy stronger state
Makes me with thy strength to communicate.*

3.7 Blending

Blending is not a process which expressed considerable productivity in the times that Shakespeare wrote. Most of the blends in the English lexicon are of more recent origin. However, Shakespeare is said to have "familiarized" contrived words such as *glaze*,¹⁰ a combination of the initial and final clusters of *glare* and *gaze* to be found in *Julius Caesar* line 21 of Act I, Scene 3: *Against the Capitoll I met a Lyon Who glaz'd vpon me, and went surly by.* The very fact that Shakespeare employed such lexical creative device must have prompted every other similar tendency of combining syllables from different words.

4. SHAKESPEARE AS A FORMATIVE ROOT

To round up the discussion and adhere to the spirit of the paper, this segment will be dealing with all those lexical instances of English which have been formed with the help of Shakespeare's name. Shakespeare's great name served as a basis for the creation of a number of words, probably more words than could have been devised with the names of other authors. To be more precise, in this train of pursuit we are after the words in which the name *Shakespeare* was used as a root in the process of deriving new words by adding different suffixes. The very fact that there have been many things written about Shakespeare from different perspectives speaks enough of the fact that there has always been a

¹⁰ See: B. Strang (1977:91)

sufficient amount of motivation to expand the lexical fields used for commenting on the author or any other poet for that matter.

At its own, aside from referring to this individual who lived in the 16th and 17th century, the name of William Shakespeare has been used in English to refer to 'a person (occas. a thing) comparable to Shakespeare, esp. as being pre-eminent in a particular sphere'.

1821 M. Edgeworth *Let. 23 Oct. (1971) 243 Humboldt is the Shakespear of travellers - as much superior in genius to other travellers as Shakespeare to other poets.*

1859 A. J. Munby *Diary 17 Mar. (1972) 28 When the poetic soul has learnt to see the poetic side of all such things, then we may have a Homer of the railway and a Shakespeare of the Ballot.*

1905 Mark Twain' in *N. Amer. Rev. Jan. 3 The telegraph, the telephone the Pullman car the Shakespeares of the inventor-tribe, so to speak.*

1931 R. Campbell *Georgiad ii. 36 A Fabian Shakespeare of the Summer Schools To other poets laying down my rules.*

No person should be surprised if we mention that the name Shakespeare is a word which has a nominal grammatical function, such as, I am convinced, all Anglicists have used sooner or later in their lives, and then in the attributive function, as in phrases Shakespeare collar, Shakespeare country or Shakespeare industry. However, it must be conceded as uncanny when the name of the great poet is used in the stead of an intransitive verb form in a sentence, meaning 'to act in one of his plays'. It was something achieved, and for that reason apparently recorded by the lexicographers of OED, by no other person than George Bernard Shaw, another person to whom those who speak the English language as we know it should be indebted, and who wrote the following: *Madame de Navarro has declaimed, spouted, statuesqued, Shakespeared, and all the rest of it.* 'Our Theatres in Nineties' (1932) II. 90

The OED has a nice collection of 11 additional lexical items that have been formed on the basis of the name of Shakespeare. These are the well-known adjective *Shakespearian*, and therefrom derived adverb *Shakespearianly*, but also the less used verbs such as *Shakespearize*, but the list of nouns is the most prominent, with some exotic items *Shakespearian*, *Shakespeareology*, *Shakespeareolatry*, *Shakespeareolater*, *Shakespearite*, *Shakespearism*, *Shakespearianizing*, and *Shakespearianism*.

5. CONCLUSION

At the very end we shall say that even his arch rival in writing, Ben Johnson, had only but praise for Shakespeare's language and style. Johnson, in his own way again, saw that Shakespeare's 'true-filed lines' had the power of a 'lance as brandish'd at the eyes of ignorance'. And true enough, Shakespeare has enriched the language and the formative lexical modes by insisting on the freedom of expression, unbridled verbal extravaganza, richness of imagery that produced words of new and adequate precision and set models for ever more and more words to be absorbed by the language and created on his patterns. As we have seen, at certain moments the English language was perhaps not even ready to accept some of Shakespeare's lexical offspring.

Apparently, Shakespeare's influence on English word formative processes was the strongest in terms of compounding words, adjectives in particular, but also in the domain of converting nouns to verbs and vice versa. A number of borrowed words and derivatives obtained by means of adjective-forming suffixes also suggest the prevalent lexical feature of Shakespeare's writing. Having planted a number of more or less peculiar words in English, the great poet unwittingly provided future generations with lexical items which were to serve as a foil to any similar words, both in the formal and the artistic sense.

As such, the subject matter of this article might have called for a full-fledged study, having in mind the vastness of the material, but the intention was to outline the venues of impact for a crucial artist of the age on the language in the field of word-formation.

REFERENCES:

1. Baugh, A. C. (1957). *A History of the English Language*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
2. Biese, Y. M. (1941). *Origin and Development of Conversions in English*. Helsinki: Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, B 45, 2.
3. Bradley, H. (1975). *Making of English*. London: The Macmillan Press.
4. Fennell A. B (2003). *A History of English*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

5. Jespersen, O (1978). *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
6. McKnight, G. (1956). *The Evolution of the English Language*. New York: Dover Publications.
7. *Oxford English Dictionary 2 on CD-ROM*, version 1.01 (1992). Oxford: OUP.
8. Potter, S. (1977) *Our Language*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
9. Strang, B. M. H. (1977) *A History of English*. London: Methuen & Co.
10. Shakespeare, W. (1990) *The Complete Works*. Oxford: OUP.